

N  
008

400/15

*Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. July 1905.*

---

**CONFIDENTIAL.**

---

(8472.)

**PART I.**

---

**CORRESPONDENCE**

RESPECTING THE

**AFFAIRS OF ARABIA.**

---

January and February 1905.

---

CONFIDENTIAL

F.O. (5100.)

406 Correspondence respecting the Protestant Bishopric at Jerusalem.

No. 1.

Court Minister to Earl Granville.—(Received July 21.)

(Translation.)

My Lord,

German Embassy, July 17, 1882.

AS your Lordship is aware, the Prussian Crown has as yet made no use of the right to fill up the Episcopal See of Jerusalem, vacated by the death of Bishop Barclay. Considerations of various kinds have, in the meantime, determined the Emperor, my august Sovereign, to instruct me to enter into negotiations with your Lordship with a view to cancelling the Agreement come to in 1841 respecting the Bishopric of Jerusalem.

It is not only the necessity, springing from its internal needs, of freeing the largely increased German community from dependence on the Anglican sister Church, and giving it an independent organization, but also the fact that the results of the existing Agreement have but in a small measure fulfilled the views and expectations of His late Majesty the King of Prussia, which has determined my Imperial Master to take this course.

In informing your Lordship of the above, I have the honour furthermore fully to lay before you the grounds which appear to us to make the withdrawal of Prussia from that Agreement to be desirable.

The idea of His late Majesty King William IV, which led him to establish joint action with England as regards the erection of the Bishopric of Jerusalem, was of the following nature:—

Firstly. To exhibit the unity of the Evangelical Church, in the face of the old Churches, which have for ages past got a firm footing at the Holy Sepulchre, and more especially in the face of the Turkish Government and people, to whom, up to that time, Evangelical Christianity was almost unknown, and from whom its external recognition, together with the political rights bound up with it, had first to be obtained by great efforts.

Besides those political considerations, the mind of the King was very deeply influenced by the feeling that the outward exhibition of an unity of faith among the Evangelical Churches might perhaps pave the way for internal unity and association among all sections of Evangelical Christians throughout the world, and that they, "forgetting their dissensions, and mindful only of their unity, might stretch forth to each other the hand of peace and concord over the cradle and the grave of the Saviour."

Led by such thoughts, His Majesty recommended his Minister, Dr. Bunsen, in his negotiations with the authorities of the English Church, above all things to press for the greatest possible similarity in the organization and direction of the two Churches in the Holy Land.

His second leading idea on the subject was to stipulate that proper attention should be paid to the independence of the Evangelical German Church, for a position of sisterly equality was sought.

The agreement, however, framed to carry out these fundamental ideas did so but very partially. The external union of the two Churches sought to be attained in the Anglican Bishopric of Jerusalem was from the very beginning not attained without prejudice to the equal rights of the German Evangelical Church and community. This is specially apparent in the necessity for the Bishop-Elect, even when named by Prussia, to be consecrated according to the Anglican rite, and in his being required to sign the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Confession of Faith, which practically excludes divines of the Evangelical German Church from being nominated.

[259]

Further, the Archbishop of Canterbury, as Metropolitan of the Bishopric of Jerusalem, has reserved to himself the right of an absolute veto against the Bishop-Elect, even when nominated by Prussia. Clergymen of the German community must subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles, and be ordained according to the Anglican rite, and finally, the Bishop is required to confirm over German catechumens according to the English ritual. These are facts well known to your Lordship.

With regard to the other provisions of the Agreement above referred to, the grave difficulties of which, from a conscientious point of view, are obvious, it is certainly owing to the good spirit and absence of narrow-mindedness of Bishop Gobat, who was nominated by Prussia shortly after the erection of the Bishopric, that they never attained practical importance. But Bishop Gobat himself thought it necessary to point out that his own moderation in these matters was not binding on his successors. And, apart from the question whether Bishop Gobat's successors may or may not be induced by special negotiations to show similar moderation, these provisions of the Agreement must be regarded in themselves as incompatible with the fundamental idea of the King, which was to claim equality for the German Evangelical Church.

Stress also must be laid on the inequality as regards external position in which the two communities united under the Episcopal See were from the very beginning placed, and which was especially marked in the secondary place assigned to the German service as compared with the Anglican. The principal service in the Anglican Church (Christ Church) was always exclusively English, the subordinate afternoon service alone was assigned to the German rite. Moreover, when, in the year 1869, a special German preacher was appointed, the latter was only allowed to perform the service alternately with an English clergyman. In this way, too, the sisterly equality of the German Church suffers serious injury.

Moreover, the further development of the mutual relations of the Churches in the Holy Land has not corresponded to the noble aim of the King, nor to the expectations entertained by the Church. The just claims of the German Evangelical Church to independence and complete equality with the Anglican Church within the Diocese of Jerusalem have not been satisfied under any of the Bishops who have since filled the Episcopal See of Jerusalem.

There is, moreover, just as little reason to believe that the idea of the King is in course of realization, according to which the Bishopric of Jerusalem was to pave the way for a comprehensive *rapprochement* of the various Evangelical Churches. These, however, have all remained each in its own national isolation, and it may be assumed that, as far as religious views are concerned, scarcely any serious value would be attached by the English High\* Church to the maintenance of communion, based upon absolute equality, with the Evangelical Church of Prussia.

Further, if we consider the practical advantages which it was expected would accrue to the German community from the establishment of a Bishopric, they have, in part, not been realized, and, in part, have lost their significance.

The interests of the German community, in the face of the Turkish authorities, have not received countenance from the Bishop; on the contrary, the protection of the German Evangelical Church and community has always been exclusively in the hands of the Prussian or German Consul.

The erection of a German chapel has provided better than in former times for the German religious service; so long, however, as the communion between the two Churches continues, and it is required by the Bishop that the interests of the German Church should be subordinated to the principal service of the English Church, there remains the inconvenience, deeply felt by the German community, of the German service having to be held at an hour unusually early for Eastern habits.\*

It is characteristic of the inequality between the two Churches that the common Bishop cannot officiate in the German chapel, since it is not consecrated according to the English rite, and, consequently, no Bishop has ever appeared in the German chapel.

Of all the objects which His Late Majesty of Prussia had in view on the conclusion of the agreement, but one can be said to exist which may still be considered important, namely, the appearance of unity presented to the outside world by the two Evangelical Churches. Though far from depreciating the value of this appearance of unity, we must yet not forget that it has already been relaxed, through the severance of the Churches, as regards the celebration of their services; and that this unity, perhaps a necessity on the first establishment of a Protestant community, has now, after the lapse of forty years, and the acquisition by both Protestant bodies of a

\* See in orig.

recognized position among the other Christian Churches, as well as in the face of the authorities of the country, hardly any practical value. Finally, the great changes which have taken place in the course of the last forty years in the German Protestant colony must, in considering this question, be taken into view.

At that time a German community can hardly be said to have existed, but it had to be called into life by the side of the English Mission Station already established, and it was only with the humblest beginnings that it first emerged into being. Now, however, that it exceeds the English colony in numbers, that it is provided with a chapel and school, a clergyman and teachers, with a hospital, and with various admirable invalid and orphan homes, it is in no respect inferior, in the extent and perfection of its organization, to the English sister community. The one thing still wanting to make its independent organization clearly manifest to the world is the possession of a church, which shall be able to hold its own with the churches of the other communions, and this, it is to be hoped, it will before long possess.

I shall feel much obliged to your Lordship for information as to the views of Her Majesty's Government respecting the wish I have expressed for the dissolution of the relations hitherto existing, upon which subject your Lordship will doubtless confer with the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London.

I avail, &c.  
(Signed) MONSTER.

No. 2.

*Foreign Office to the Archbishop of Canterbury.*

My Lord Archbishop,

*Foreign Office, August 9, 1882.*

I AM directed by Earl Granville to transmit to your Grace the accompanying translation of a note from the German Ambassador, stating that it is the wish of the German Government to cancel the existing arrangement respecting the Bishopric of Jerusalem.\*

Lord Granville will be glad to learn the views of the Trustees as regards this proposal.

I am, &c.  
(Signed) JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

No. 2\*.

*Foreign Office to Mr. J. B. Lee.*

Sir,

*Foreign Office, December 13, 1882.*

I AM directed by Earl Granville to state that the German Ambassador has repeatedly pressed for an answer to his letter of the 17th July upon the subject of the Bishopric of Jerusalem, and I am to request that you will convey to the Trustees and Prelates concerned in this question the expression of Lord Granville's hope that he may be enabled to come to some decision in the matter with as little delay as possible.

I am, &c.  
(Signed) JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

No. 3.

*Mr. J. B. Lee to Foreign Office.—(Received December 18.)*

Sir,

*2, The Sanctuary, Westminster, December 15, 1882.*

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge your letter of the 13th instant, referring to the German Ambassador's letter of the 17th July last to Earl Granville, upon the subject of the Bishopric of Jerusalem, to which letter Earl Granville desires to be enabled to send an answer.

Unfortunately, the long illness of the late Archbishop, who had been despatched to communicate with Lord Granville on the subject, has prevented any action being taken. But I will take care the correspondence is handed to his Grace's successor.

I have, &c.  
(Signed) JOHN B. LEE.

ment is willing, under certain conditions, to maintain in the future the existing mutual relations. The Imperial Government wishes, however, previous to laying before His Majesty proposals relative to the nomination of a new Bishop of Jerusalem, to come to a special understanding, by means of negotiation ("auf dem Wege der Verhandlung"), on two points which have given offence in many cases to the German clergy.

The first of these points concerns the right of veto reserved to the Archbishop of Canterbury relative to the nomination of a Bishop by the Prussian Crown, whereby His Majesty is placed in a position towards the English Archbishop which does not conform to their relative stations.

The second point concerns the question whether the Bishop nominated by the Prussian Government, if he belong to a German Evangelical Church, besides the Episcopal consecration, is to submit also to a reordination by the Anglican Church, and to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles thereof.

Your Excellency will from this find that the wish of the Imperial Government to see these two points settled in a satisfactory manner is justified.

The Imperial Government hopes all the more to venture to reckon upon this, as the Archbishop, in his letter mentioned at the commencement, designates the German objections as not without grounds, and expresses the hope that means and ways may be found to remove the objections made by Germany.

I have, &c.  
(Signed) MÜNSTER.

## No. 8.

*Foreign Office to the Archbishop of Canterbury.*

My Lord Archbishop,  
Foreign Office, January 30, 1854.  
WITH reference to my letter to your Grace of the 13th of last July, I have the honour, by Earl Granville's directions, to transmit to you herewith, for your Grace's observations, translation of a letter which has been received from the German Ambassador at this Court, explaining the conditions upon which his Government would be prepared to acquiesce in the continuance of the existing arrangements for the maintenance of the Bishopric of Jerusalem.

I am, &c.  
(Signed) JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

## No. 9.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to Earl Granville.—(Received February 11.)*

My Lord,  
Addington Park, Croydon, February 9, 1854.  
I HAVE given my best consideration to the letter from Count Münster to your Lordship with reference to the Jerusalem Bishopric, inclosed in your Lordship's communication of the 30th January.

The letter in question, which your Lordship is good enough to submit for my "observations," while expressing the willingness of the Imperial Government to maintain, under certain conditions, the existing mutual relation, conveys, if I understand it rightly, certain objections felt by some members of the German community to certain of the conditions which were originally agreed upon as the basis upon which the mutual arrangement was arrived at.

Your Lordship will, I think, understand how impossible it would be for me to state with any explicitness or authority the view of those who are directly concerned in this important matter, unless I were furnished in a more definite shape with the distinct modifications which the Imperial Government would wish to make in the conditions originally laid down as a basis of joint action.

So far as I am able at present to judge, I fear there would be very great difficulty caused in the minds of many by such modifications as are sketched in Count Münster's letter, on account of their apparent divergence from principles of discipline in the Church of England; but I should be wanting in respect were I to express a decided opinion upon these modifications, unless I had them before me in a definite shape.

It has always been upon the understanding that the original conditions on both sides would be observed, that support has in England been accorded to the scheme.

I have, &c.  
(Signed) EDW. GANTUAR.

## No. 10.

*Memorandum (No. 1) communicated by Baron Bunsen, September 19, 1854.*

(Translation.)  
(Confidential)

THE Agreement concluded in the year 1841 touching the erection of the Bishopric at Jerusalem is, of course, not couched in the terms of an International Treaty between the Prussian and English Governments.

The Agreement, however, is not on this account a private Treaty. The Envoy of His Majesty the King of Prussia treated for the Agreement, and concluded it with the Heads and Representatives of the English Church.

The negotiations were carried on not only with the knowledge and approval of the English Government, but the Envoy Von Bunsen had also direct negotiations upon the matter with Lord Palmerston.

The further co-operation on the part of the English Government respecting the question took place in two directions: with regard to the Turkish Government, with a view to secure the acquiescence of the local authorities in the erection of an Evangelical Bishopric in Jerusalem, and with regard to the English Church, with a view to give that Church legal power to consecrate a Bishop for Jerusalem, and confer upon him spiritual jurisdiction in his diocese. For this purpose the English Government at the time obtained from Parliament a special Public Act sanctioned by Her Majesty the Queen.

From this procedure it clearly appears that the case of the Agreement of 1841 was not one of a private Treaty, but of an Agreement which was concluded, with the acquiescence of the English Government, between His Majesty King Frederick William IV, who then wore the Crown of Prussia, and was invested with the authority of the Prussian State on the one side and the English Church on the other, and which must be judged by the rules of international law.

Moreover, the Decree of Endowment issued by King Frederick William IV, with the counter-signature of the Minister Von Thile, wherein is recited that His Majesty will, for the endowment of an Evangelical Bishopric of Jerusalem, which will be founded by the Crown and Church of England, contribute half the necessary funds, and wherein this contribution is made a charge on the money at our disposal ("Disposition-Kasse"), that is, a State fund, is not to be regarded as a deed binding His Majesty the King or the Prussian State privately, but as an Act issued by His Majesty the King of Prussia in the exercise of his sovereign rights.

For the abrogation, further defining, or modification of the Agreement of the year 1841, Prussia has therefore to treat diplomatically with the English Government, as the authority which represents the English Church before foreign Powers.

The thought which animated the late King in suggesting and erecting a Bishopric in Jerusalem, and which found definite expression in 1841, was that in the places where once the Saviour walked, and side by side with the Ecclesiastical Bodies who had from former ages been located there, the Evangelical Church also should acquire a home and citizenship, and that in the institution to be created for this purpose the sisterly relations of the Evangelical Churches of Germany and England should be manifested.

With the object of realising this idea, negotiations were opened between the King's Envoy Von Bunsen and the Crown of England as Representative of the English Church.

The understanding which was soon brought about was put in writing in the Envoy Von Bunsen's Memorandum of the 25th July, 1851, entitled, "The Church at Jerusalem," which, early in August of the same year, was subjected to a further revision and discussion in the Conference at Addington, and approved with slight modifications. This Memorandum, modified pursuant to the Addington Resolutions, which the Representatives of the English Church expressly acknowledged in a common letter to the King, formed, as Von Bunsen points out in the clearest manner in his Report of the 16th August, 1851, "the record of the Agreement with the English Church upon the spirit, object, scope and form of the creation of the Bishopric."

Of course the Memorandum as a record of the Agreement concluded, was, as such, unsuitable for publication, so that further negotiations followed with the design of securing an instrument adapted for publication in the Evangelical Churches of both kingdoms, but which touched the material part of the Agreement only in certain unimportant points.

Thus, the Memorandum, with the modifications resulting from the Addington Resolutions, must, in so far as no alteration of its substance can be shown to have been effected by subsequent negotiations, be still looked upon as the record of the Agreement come to with the English Church for the foundation of the Bishopric.

No. 11.

*Memorandum (No. 2) communicated by Baron Plessen, September 19, 1884.*

(Translation.)

*Memorandum respecting the Two Points upon which the Royal Prussian Government desires, in case the Assent to the Dissolution of the Compact 1841 concerning the Foundation of the Bishopric at Jerusalem should not be attainable, to come to an understanding with the Royal Government.*

THE first point concerns the veto pertaining to the Archbishop of Canterbury upon the right of nomination by the Prussian Crown, which, by the indefiniteness with which it is expressed, places His Majesty the Emperor and King in an improper position.

The English Church cannot justifiably take up the position that the right of veto in this indefinite form rests upon the Agreement concluded. The construction of the Articles of the English Prelates of the 7th December, 1841, does not appear in this respect to be in harmony with that which was before stipulated between them and the Envoy Von Bunsen.

According to Von Bunsen's Memorandum of the 25th July, 1841, the rights and functions of the English Primate respecting the nomination of the Bishop were to be identical in respect of the Crowns of England and Prussia. The veto in respect of the Crown of England was, however, described as the veto of the Church.

The Addington Articles sketched by Von Bunsen, and submitted after their approval by the English Prelates to Lord Palmerston, contain with respect to that right of veto only the proviso: "as the Archbishop may have no canonical objection to consecrate."

Finally, Von Bunsen, in his Report of the 23rd July, 1841, likewise describes the veto as a veto of the Church, adding "that is the English form, though only form."

Since the Archbishop of Canterbury has expressed himself orally to Count Minister to the effect that the objections of the Royal Prussian Government respecting the veto might be removed by his declaring distinctly that he would exercise the right only in the case of proved canonical defects, this point might be regarded as adjusted, by the express and formal delivery of such a declaration, in which the canonical defects justifying the exercise of the right of veto should be more closely defined.

The second point relates to the declaration which it is desired to obtain from the English Church, that in the case of an ordained ecclesiastic of one of the German Evangelical National Churches being nominated Bishop by the Prussian Crown, such ecclesiastic should not be bound in order to obtain the consecration which it pertains to the Archbishop of Canterbury to give, to submit to reordination by the Anglican Church and to the concomitant subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles.

This declaration must be demanded, because otherwise the right of the Prussian Crown to nominate alternately with the English Crown would be almost valueless. Moreover, it is required by the German Church, seeing that it would be incompatible with her position, that the fact of being an English clergyman should alone constitute the qualification for the See of Jerusalem, and that a German ecclesiastic should be unable to acquire such qualification otherwise than by entering the English, and, consequently, quitting the German, Church.

This would signify a difference in the estimation set upon the two Churches which the German Church cannot accept, and which would stand in flagrant contradiction to

the sisterly position of both Churches striven for by the late King. The right of nomination of the Prussian Crown would, besides, be robbed of an essential part of its substance were that Crown obliged to nominate ecclesiastics of the English Church, while those of the German Church would be excluded as such from being nominated.

Nor does the demand for this declaration appear to be an alteration of the stipulations of 1841. Rather do they afford it a substantial basis, as appears from the following:—

Von Bunsen's Memorandum of the 25th July, 1841, does not, indeed, in its essential provisions, lay down anything further respecting the nomination of the Bishop than that the Archbishop of Canterbury has the Church's veto over the Bishops nominated by the Prussian, equally with those nominated by the English, Crown, "and performs the episcopal consecration." This provision, however, finds an unambiguous explanation in the context of the preceding Article I, since it is there stated that it must "appear in the highest degree desirable" that the Bishop of Jerusalem should, in addition to the ordinary essentials of a Bishop, possess the following qualifications:—

1. Jewish descent.
2. Learning.
3. Membership of the Ministry of the English Church.

The last qualification is accordingly specified only as desirable, not as generally necessary, and not as more desirable than the desideratum placed first, *i.e.*, Jewish extraction, to which, after the first nomination in 1841, no importance was attached, in the two subsequent cases, either by the Prussian or by the English Crown. Accordingly, the necessity of the entrance of the Bishop into the Ministry of the English Church is not here put forward. To the same view also corresponds the position of the Bishopric with regard to the English Church, as indicated in Von Bunsen's Memorandum as regards the duration of its connection with Prussia; the Bishopric of Jerusalem was to be exclusively English from such time only as a Bishopric should be founded at Bethlehem—as formerly contemplated by the late King; up to such time it was to continue to be jointly English and German.

Agreeably with this the so-called Addington Articles make the performance of the consecration dependent merely upon the absence of canonical impediments. But that the want of Anglican priest's orders is not in itself to be considered as a canonical objection in the way of consecration may be inferred from the Act of Parliament of the 8th October, 1841, obtained expressly in connection with the foundation of the Jerusalem Bishopric, and according to which the Archbishop's right, already existing in virtue of a previous Act, to consecrate ("weihen")<sup>\*</sup> the subjects of any nation, is so far extended that it can be exercised, regardless whether such subjects are subjects of the land in which they are to discharge their office or not. That no preliminary English ordination or rather reordination is to be exacted of such foreign Bishops is apparent from the nature of the matter.

Finally, the Envoy Von Bunsen replied, *inter alia*, as follows, to an instruction imparted to him with reference to the consecration to be obtained from the English Church for our first Bishop and clergy in Palestine, in his Report of the 22nd August, 1841: "If, in the Instructions (for Von Bunsen's negotiations with the English Church) it is said, 'The Bishop nominated for Bethlehem will come for consecration to the English Church,' this presupposes that there cannot be, and is not to be, any question of reordination. Here also, then, we have come to a complete understanding. The form of consecration of the English Church does not inquire whether the man is a priest or not."

Even were the substance of the Agreement upon the point in question not placed beyond doubt by the circumstance that the Bishops nominated by Prussia for Jerusalem, in case they have not English priest's orders, are to be consecrated without them, all uncertainty would be removed by the further contents of the Report, wherein Von Bunsen says:—

"The Bishops consider it just that so long as your Majesty has no Bishopric of your own in the Holy Land, that now founded should hereafter have alternately a Prussian or an English Bishop; or, more accurately, one proposed to the Primate alternately by your Majesty and by the Crown of England. For your Majesty might propose an Englishman, instead of one of your subjects. In any case, the Primate would consecrate him according to the English form of consecration, just in the same way as the possible Bishop of Bethlehem. In a word, your Majesty will get in

\* The word employed in the original is "weihen," which signifies either ordination or consecration.  
(249)

Jerusalem that which you wished for in Bethlehem, until the foundation of a Bishopric at the last-named place is possible."

It will be seen that for the Bishops of the exclusively Prussian See which it was intended to found subsequently at Bethlehem, the reception of English priest's orders or subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles could not have been contemplated as a necessary preliminary to consecration.

Previously to his Report of the 22nd August, 1841, a shorter Report of Von Bunsen's, of the 20th of the same month, speaks in the same sense with the foregoing observations, although with greater brevity:—

"The expression 'consecration' presupposes that no ordination precedes even when the man has not been ordained by a Bishop."

## No. 12.

*Earl Granville to the Archbishop of Canterbury.*

My Lord,

Foreign Office, December 6, 1884.

I HAVE the honour to inform your Grace that I referred to the German Ambassador at this Court the letter with which you were good enough to favour me on the 8th February last, on the subject of the existing arrangement between Germany and this country respecting the question of the Jerusalem Bishopric, and the objections put forward by certain members of the German community in regard to some of the conditions of that Arrangement.

I have now the honour to transmit to your Grace translation of two papers which have been placed in my hands by the German Chargé d'Affaires at this Court,\* containing a history of this question and further particulars as to the modifications which the Imperial Government would wish to have made in the conditions originally laid down in the Agreement of 1841; and I should be glad to be favoured with such further observations as the additional information furnished in the accompanying Memorandum will enable your Grace to offer.

I have the honour to add that, in leaving these papers, Baron Pleseus observed that he was instructed to state that the recent payments towards the support of the Bishopric had been made by the German Government without prejudice in regard to future arrangements.

I am, &c.  
(Signed) GRANVILLE.

## No. 13.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Earl of Rosebery.—(Received February 20.)*

My Lord,

Lambeth Palace, February 19, 1886.

I HAVE the honour to state that the letter of the 6th December, 1884, on the subject of the Jerusalem Bishopric Fund, addressed to me by Earl Granville as the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, has, with the Memoranda which accompanied that letter, received the most careful consideration of the Trustees of the Jerusalem Bishopric Fund, and that on the 28th July, 1886, the Trustees passed the following Resolution:—

"That it is desirable that the original Arrangement made between the English and Prussian Governments, for the appointment of the Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem and his maintenance, be forthwith rescinded."

I have the honour, further, to state that, having conferred with his Grace the Archbishop of York and the Lord Bishop of London upon the terms of this Resolution and upon the matter generally, we are prepared to consent to the determination of the Arrangement arrived at in 1841, and I beg to request that your Lordship will kindly communicate this to the German Government.

As this course is evidently in accord with the wishes of the German Government, I assume that some short Memorandum should be drawn up and signed on their

\* Nos. 10 and 11.

behalf, and by myself, stating that by mutual consent the Arrangement of 1841 has been determined.

I have, &c.  
(Signed) EDW. CANTUAR.

## No. 14.

*The Earl of Rosebery to Archbishop of Canterbury.*

My Lord Archbishop,

Foreign Office, March 20, 1886.

I HAVE the honour to inclose, for your Grace's information, copy of a letter which I have addressed to the German Ambassador at this Court, in consequence of your Grace's communication of the 19th February, informing his Excellency that the Trustees under the English Deed of Endowment are prepared to consent to the termination by mutual consent of the Arrangement of 1841 for the creation and maintenance of the Jerusalem Bishopric.\*

I am, &c.  
(Signed) ROSEBERY.

## No. 15.

*The Earl of Rosebery to Count Hatzfeldt.*

M. l'Amassador,

Foreign Office, March 20, 1886.

WITH reference to previous correspondence respecting the Bishopric of Jerusalem, I have the honour to acquaint your Excellency, for the information of your Government, that his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury has intimated to me that the Trustees under the English Deed of Endowment are prepared to consent to the termination by mutual consent of the Arrangement of 1841, as your Excellency will perceive from the inclosed copy of his Grace's letter.†

I should be glad to be favoured with the views of your Excellency as to the best mode of recording and carrying out the cancelling of the Arrangement of 1841, for the information of the Archbishop and the Trustees of the English Deed of 1841.

I am, &c.  
(Signed) ROSEBERY.

## No. 16.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Earl of Rosebery.—(Received March 24.)*

My Lord,

Lambeth Palace, March 23, 1886.

I AM directed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to acknowledge, with his thanks, the receipt of your Lordship's letter, dated the 20th March, and of the copy of a communication addressed to the German Ambassador at this Court, bearing the same address, on the subject of the Bishopric of Jerusalem.

I have, &c.  
(Signed) MONTAGUE FOWLER, Chaplain.

## No. 17.

*The Earl of Rosebery to Sir R. Malet.*

(No. 194.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, April 2, 1886.

IN the course of conversation to-day, Count Hatzfeldt touched on the subject of the Bishopric of Jerusalem, and stated, with reference to my communication to him of the 20th March, intimating that the Trustees under the English Deed of Endowment were prepared to consent to the termination of the Arrangement of 1841, that as both the parties to it were now agreed, it only remained to discuss the form in which the withdrawal should be made. He suggested that he should write a formal note to

\* No. 15.

† No. 15.

me, withdrawing, on behalf of Germany, from that Arrangement, and that I, in reply, should address an identical note to him.

He asked if I saw any objection to this method of proceeding, and I replied that I saw none.

I am, &c.  
(Signed) ROSEBURY.

No. 18.

*The Earl of Rosebery to the Archbishop of Canterbury.*

My Lord Archbishop,

WITH reference to my letter of the 20th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit to your Grace herewith a copy of a despatch which I have addressed to Her Majesty's Ambassador at Berlin, recording a conversation with the German Ambassador on the subject of the forms to be observed in terminating the Agreement of 1841 for the endowment of the Bishopric of Jerusalem.\*

I am, &c.  
(Signed) ROSEBURY.

No. 19.

*Count Hatzfeldt to the Earl of Iddesleigh.—(Received December 6.)*

(Translation.)

My Lord,  
German Embassy, London, December 4, 1886.

IN a note dated the 20th March last, I was informed by Lord Rosebery that the Trustees of the Bishopric of Jerusalem had declared their readiness to consent to the termination of the Agreement of 1841.

I am now instructed to inform your Lordship that the Royal Prussian Government, in agreement with the Trustees of the Bishopric, declare the said Agreement terminated, and liberates the Trustees from all obligations incurred thereby.

While awaiting the communication of a similar declaration on the part of the Trustees, I have the honour to add that His Imperial Majesty puts great value on the continuance, after the Treaty relations with the English Church have ceased, of the harmonious co-operation of the two Evangelical sister Churches for all purposes hitherto provided for by their outward ties.

Finally, I have the honour to state that the Royal Government takes it for granted that the use of the churchyard for its proper purpose by both Communities on an equal footing, as well as the equal right of the clergymen of each to perform the proper services, shall continue until a possible agreement shall have been arrived at by the two Communities.

I have, &c.  
(Signed) HATZFELDT.

No. 20.

*The Earl of Iddesleigh to the Archbishop of Canterbury.*

My Lord Archbishop,

FOREIGN OFFICE, December 11, 1886.  
I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Grace the accompanying translation of a letter from the German Ambassador at this Court,† in which his Excellency states that, having been informed by my predecessor on the 20th March last, that the Trustees of the Bishopric of Jerusalem had declared their readiness to consent to the termination of the Agreement of 1841, the Prussian Government declares the said Agreement terminated, and liberates the Trustees from all obligations incurred thereby.

I have now to request your Grace to be so good as to inform me in what manner the Trustees desire their declaration to a similar effect to be made; whether it is wished

\* No. 17.

† No. 19.

that I should make it on the Trustees' behalf, or whether they would prefer to send a written statement for transmission to the German Ambassador.

I should at the same time be glad to be informed what reply should be returned to Count Hatzfeldt's observations in regard to the continued co-operation of the sister Evangelical Churches, and the common use of the churchyard by the two Communities.

In handing in the letter, Count Hatzfeldt stated verbally that his Government having paid their contribution up to the 31st March, 1885, consider that no further payment is expected from them. I presume that the Trustees concur in this view.

I am, &c.  
(Signed) IDDESLEIGH.

No. 21.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Earl of Iddesleigh.—(Received December 23.)*

My Lord,

ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON, December 20, 1886.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's letter of the 11th December, inclosing translation of a letter from the German Ambassador in London, formally declaring the Agreement on the part of the Royal Prussian Government as to the appointment of an Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem terminated, and requesting a similar declaration on the part of the English Trustees.

In pursuance of a Resolution of the Trustees dated the 28th July, 1886, communicated to me by them with the request that I would act upon it (referred to in my letter to Lord Rosebery of February 1886), I have the honour to request your Lordship, on behalf of the Trustees, to declare the said Agreement with the Royal Prussian Government terminated, and to liberate that Government from all obligations incurred thereby.

I most readily concur in the desire expressed in Count Hatzfeldt's letter as to the future harmonious cooperation of the Churches and the continued common use of the churchyard as hitherto, and I concur in the view that no payment beyond the 31st March, 1886, is expected from the German Government.

I have, &c.  
(Signed) EDW. CANTUAR.

No. 22.

*The Earl of Iddesleigh to the Archbishop of Canterbury.*

My Lord Archbishop,

FOREIGN OFFICE, December 31, 1886.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Grace's letter of the 20th instant, in regard to the Bishopric of Jerusalem, and to transmit herewith, for the approval of the English Trustees, the draft of a communication which it is proposed, in accordance with your Grace's request, to address to the German Chargé d'Affaires in this country, liberating the Prussian Government from all obligations incurred by them under the Agreement of 1841.\*

I am, &c.  
(Signed) IDDESLEIGH.

No. 23.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Earl of Iddesleigh.—(Received January 7.)*

My Lord,

ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON, January 6, 1887.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's letter of the 31st ultimo, on the subject of the Anglican Bishopric in Jerusalem, inclosing a draft of a communication which your Lordship proposes to address to the German Chargé d'Affaires in England, for the purpose of liberating the Prussian Government from the obligations imposed by the Agreement of 1841.

\* Not printed.

The draft in question appears to me to express the conditions correctly, and would meet in all respects the views of the Trustees.

The five Trustees properly so-called have applied the Fund according to the Deed of Endowment under the direction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York, and the Bishop of London, and these prelates, as well as the Trustees properly so-called, have given their consent to the conclusion of the Agreement.

I have, &c.  
(Signed) EDW. CANTUAR.

No. 24.

*The Earl of Iddesleigh to Baron von Plese.*

M. le Chargé d'Affairs,

*Foreign Office, January 8, 1887.*

I DULY communicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury Count Hatzfeldt's letter of the 4th ultimo, formally declaring the Agreement on the part of the Royal Prussian Government as to the appointment of an Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem terminated, and requesting a similar declaration on the part of the English Trustees.

I have the honour to acquaint you that his Grace, on behalf of the Trustees, now requests me to declare the said Agreement with the Royal Prussian Government terminated, and to liberate that Government from all obligations incurred thereby.

The Archbishop most readily concurs in the desire expressed in Count Hatzfeldt's letter as to the future harmonious cooperation of the Churches and the continued common use of the churchyard as hitherto; and with reference to the verbal statement made by you on Count Hatzfeldt's behalf, his Grace concurs in the view that no payment beyond the 31st March, 1895, is expected from the Prussian Government.

I have, &c.  
(Signed) IDDESLEIGH.